

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
7 AT TACOMA

8 ROBERT ALEXANDER GRIMSLEY,

CASE NO. C23-1894

9 Plaintiff,

ORDER

10 v.

11 NIKE, INC., et al.,

12 Defendants.

13 THIS MATTER is before the Court on pro se prisoner plaintiff Robert Grimsley's  
14 Motion for Relief under Rule 60, Dkt. 11. The Court adopted Magistrate Judge Michelle  
15 L. Peterson's R&R and dismissed this case without prejudice and without leave to  
16 amend, because he did not seek the Court's leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* and he did  
17 not pay the required filing fee. Dkt. 8.

18 Grimsley now seeks relief under Rule 60(b)(3), claiming that the dismissal was the  
19 result of "fraudulent representation and misconduct" by one or more of the 500 "adverse  
20 parties" he seeks to name. This assertion is wholly meritless; the Court's dismissal was  
21 based exclusively on Grimsley's failures, and it did not rely on any statement from any  
22 defendant. Indeed, there are no such statements in the record.

1 The motion for relief under Rule 60(b)(3) is **DENIED**. This case remains closed.

2 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

3 Dated this 7th day of May, 2024.

4 

5  
6 BENJAMIN H. SETTLE  
United States District Judge